REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, the Examiner noted that claims 1-11 were pending and rejected claims 1-11. Claims 1, 8 and 11 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, new claim 12 has been added; and thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-12 are pending for consideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

In item 2, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 were rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In item 3, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito (U.S. Patent No. 6,509,988).

Saito is related to high speed data transmission on an IEEE 1394 serial bus node (see column 1, lines 8-11 of Saito).

However, amended claim 1, for example, recites

> a transmission rate control circuit configured to generate a switch signal that changes an operation speed of the interface device when the transmission rate must be switched; and
>
> a clock generation circuit configured to change a frequency in response to the switch signal and generate a clock signal having the changed frequency

(claim 1, lines 4-8). Independent claim 11 recites features similar to those as independent claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted claims 1 is patentable over Saito, as Saito does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, the features of claim 1, as mentioned above, for at least the following reasons.

According to Saito, a lowest value of transmission speeds of the port transceivers in a register map of the controller is stored as a top speed of the node (see Abstract of Saito). Further, the controller receives a speed value from another node and begins packet transmission at a lower one of the stored and received speed values (see Abstract and column 2, lines 24-26 of Saito).

Therefore, instead of generat[ing] a switch signal that changes an operation speed ... when the transmission rate must be switched, Saito begins packet transmission at a lower one of the stored and received speed values when a speed value is received from another node.

Thus, in view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 11 are patentably over Saito.

In item 4, on page 4 of the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harriman Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,442,750, hereinafter "Harriman").

Harriman is related to a method and apparatus for transmitting data between nodes connected to a communications bus where the bus width is at least equal to the number of bits in a data word to be transmitted on the bus (see column 1, lines 50-54 of Harriman).

However, amended claim 8, for example, recites

> said changing operation speeds of each device and the interface device includes:
>
> the transmission rate control circuit generating a switch signal that changes an operation speed of the interface device; and
>
> the clock generation circuit changing a frequency in response to the switch signal to generate a clock signal having the changed frequency

(claim 8, lines 10-16).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted claim 8 is patentable over Harriman, as Harriman fails disclose, either expressly or inherently, the features of claim 8, as mentioned above, for at least the following reasons.

According to Harriman, the bus selection apparatus 24 selects one of a plurality of sub-buses 26a-26n and the speed selection circuitry 30 determines the maximum data rate at which the packet data can be sent to the selected bus (see column 3, lines 34-37 and column 4, lines 63-65 of Harriman).

Thus, instead of "changing a frequency ... to generate a clock signal" in response to the signal switch that changes an operation speed of the interface device, the relevant portions of Harriman is merely concerned with determining the maximum data rate at which the packet can be sent to the selected bus.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is patentable over Harriman.

In item 5, on page 7 of the Office Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over by Saito in view of Harumoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,460,097 $1).

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and inherits the patentable features thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentable over Saito taken alone. Further, nothing was cited or found in Harumoto that cures the deficiencies of Saito as mentioned above with respect

to claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentable over the combination of Saito and Harumoto.

In item 6, on page 8 of the Office Action, claim 3, 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over by Saito in view of Cook (U.S. Patent No. 5,504,757).

Claims 3 and 5-7 depend from claim 1 and inherit the patentable features thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 5-7 are patentable over Saito taken alone. Further, nothing was cited or found in Cook that cures the deficiencies of Saito as mentioned above with respect to claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 5-7 are patentable over the combination of Saito and Cook.

In item 7, on page 10 of the Office Action, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over by Saito in view of Domon (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,408 31).

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and inherits the patentable features thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is patentable over Saito taken alone. Further, nothing was cited or found in Domon that cures the deficiencies of Saito as mentioned above with respect to claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is patentable over the combination of Saito and Domon.

In item 8, on page 10 of the Office Action, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over by Harriman in view of Domon.

Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and inherits the patentable features thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is patentable over Harriman taken alone. Further, nothing was cited or found in Damon that cures the deficiencies of Harriman as mentioned above with respect to claim 8. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is patentable over the combination of Harriman and Damon.

In item 9, on page 11 of the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over by Harriman in view of Hester (U.S. Patent No. 5,097,410) and Damon.

Claim 10 indirectly depends from claim 8 and inherits the patentable features thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is patentable over Harriman taken alone. Further, nothing was cited or found in Hester or Domon that cures the deficiencies of Harriman as mentioned above with respect to claim 8. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is patentable over the combination of Harriman, Heater and Domon.

New claim 12 has been added to emphasize the feature of "a transmission rate control circuit changing an operation speed of the interface device from a low speed to a high speed in the case that a switching of the transmission rate is requested, and returning an operation speed of the interface device from the high speed to the low speed in the case that an operating state of the interface device is reset" (claim 12, lines 5-8).

It is submitted that new claim 12 is patentable over Saito, as Saito fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, the features of claim 12, as quoted above, for at least the following reasons.

According to Saito, the controller receives a speed value from another node and begins packet transmission at a lower one of the stored and received speed values (see Abstract and column 2, lines 24-26 of Saito).

Therefore, instead of changing an operation speed of the interface device from a low speed to a high speed in the case that a switching of the transmission rate is requested and returning an operation speed of the interface device from the high speed to the low speed, as in claim 12, Saito is merely concerned with beginning transmission of a packet at a lower one of the stored speed values when a speed value is received from another node and.

Further, nothing was found in any of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, that cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Saito, as mentioned above with respect to claim 12. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 12 is patentable over the cited references.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6/9/2008

By: Patel
Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501